

- 7 -

Remarks

This response is to the official action mailed in the above-referenced case on January 10, 2006, in which claims 1-36 stand rejected over Bogard, US 6757365, hereinafter Bogard.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the reference Bogard and the Examiner's remarks and indications of reliance on parts of Bogard, and has amended the claims in response, narrowing the scope of the claims.

An essential problem with the 102 rejection of the claims is that Bogard does not anywhere teach any means or mechanism for detecting a mood of the client. The teaching of Bogard is limited to *conduct*, for example, whether a client habitually follows a certain pattern in response. There is no mood detection at all. Consequently the applicant has caused the claims to be amended to have mood detection as an essential limitation.

If there are any extensions of time due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Leo Chiu

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457